



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,032	04/08/2004	Daniel J. Miller	MS1-640USC1	2257
22801	7590	06/11/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER HUYNH, BA	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,032	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ba Huynh	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/1/07 has been entered.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-39 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,768,499. Although the

Art Unit: 2179

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the broaden scopes of the pending claims are read on by the patented claims 1-32.

2. Claims 1-39 may be further subjected to a provisional double patenting rejection on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of the copending applications. Due to a large number of co-pending application filed, this provisional rejection will be resolved at the time of allowance.

NOTE: The applicant request for the Double patenting rejection to be held in abeyance until the time of allowance is noted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 37-39 are further are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims recite a data structure. Data structure is non-statutory subject matter. The data structure as recited, is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable by a computer. It appears to be just a listing of information ("one or more portions associated with at least one track of a multimedia editing project..., one or more portions associated with a composite..."), i.e., a listing of non-functional descriptive material, thus is non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 37,39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 5194952 (Pelley).

- As for claims 37, 39: Pelley teaches a computer implemented system comprising a data structure embodied on a computer readable medium, the data structure comprising: one or more portions associated with at least one track of a multi-media editing project, individual tracks being associated with one or more data stream sources; and one or more portions associated with a composite, the composite comprising at least one track (3:60-4:11, 5:31-65, 6:60-68, 16:15-30, 24:44-25:17), said data structure being configured for use in programming a software-implemented matrix switch which is configured to provide a data stream defined by the multi-media editing project (3:52-59, 10:66-11:5), the matrix switch being configured to route a scalable number of inputs to a scalable number of outputs (5:24 – 6:56. I.e., 53 inputs being scaled to 32 outputs and some of the outputs being redirected to input ports).

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Art Unit: 2179

5. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US patent application publication 2002/0023103 (Gagne), in view of US patent #5,194,952 (Pelley).

- As for claims 1, 20-21: Gagne teaches a multi-media processing method and corresponding apparatus comprising: providing multiple tracks each of which being capable of being associated with one or more digital data streams (0059, 0062); and representing the multiple tracks as a single track, i.e., the meta clip (0065-0073, figs 5-11). Gagne fails to clearly teach the implementation of the programmable software-implemented matrix switch for processing the digital data associated with the single track. However in the same field of invention, Pelley teaches the implementation of the programmable software implemented matrix switch 18 (21:53-22:24) in which multiple inputs can be routed to multiple output (21:39-52, fig 3). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Pelley's teaching of the programmable software implemented matrix switch to Gagne for processing the digital data associated with the single track (meta clip). Motivation of the combining is for the advantage of having the switch signal being dynamically re-assignable thus increasing performance and processing time. Per Pelley, the matrix switch being configured to route a scalable number of inputs to a scalable number of outputs (5:24 – 6:56. I.e., 53 inputs being scaled to 32 outputs and some of the outputs being redirected to input ports).

- As for claims 2, 3, 4: The act of representing comprises representing at least one transition between at least two of the multiple tracks (0070).

- As for claims 5-7: The act of representing comprises representing at least one effect

applied to at least one of the multiple tracks (0070).

- As for claims 8-10: The act of representing comprises representing at least one transition between at least two of the multiple tracks and at least one effect applied to at least one of the multiple tracks (0070, 0071).
- As for claims 11-13: The method further comprising operating upon said single track by applying at least one transition between at least two of the multiple tracks (0070).
- As for claims 14-16: The method further comprising operating upon said single track by applying at least one effect to at least one of the multiple tracks (0070, 0071).
- As for claims 17-19: The method further comprising operating upon said single track by applying at least one transition between at least two of the multiple tracks, and at least one effect to at least one of the multiple tracks (0070, 0071).

6. Claims 22-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US patent application publication 2002/0023103 (Gagne), in view of US patent #6,266,053 (French), further in view of US patent #5,194,952 (Pelley).

- As for claims 22, 35, 36: Gagne teaches a multi-media processing method and corresponding apparatus comprising: providing multiple tracks each of which being capable of being associated with one or more digital data streams (0059, 0062); and representing the multiple tracks as a group upon which operations can be performed that do not affect tracks that are not in the group (0065-0073, figs 5-11). A media project is a hierarchical structure of which the tracks comprise a part (a media project is a time-based hierarchy of media objects). Gagne fails to clearly teach that the hierarchy is a tree

structure. However in the same field of invention, French teaches representing a media project as a tree structure. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine French's teaching of hierarchical tree structure representation of media object to Gagne. Motivation of the combining is for the advantage of having the ability to integrate a time context and time inheritance into a graph oriented media project, as expressly suggested by French in 6:15-24. The combine Gagne&French fails to clearly teach the implementation of the programmable software-implemented matrix switch for processing the digital data associated with the single track. However in the same field of invention, Pelley teaches the implementation of the programmable software implemented matrix switch 18 (21:53-22:24) in which multiple inputs can be routed to multiple output (21:39-52, fig 3). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Pelley's teaching of the programmable software implemented matrix switch to Gagne for processing the digital data associated with the single track (meta clip). Motivation of the combining is for the advantage of having the switch signal being dynamically re-assignable thus increasing performance and processing time. Per Pelley, the matrix switch being configured to route a scalable number of inputs to a scalable number of outputs (5:24 – 6:56. I.e., 53 inputs being scaled to 32 outputs and some of the outputs being redirected to input ports).

- As for claims 23-25. The method further comprising operating on said tracks using said particular set of operations (0070, 0071).

- As for claims 26-28. The method of claim 22 further comprising operating on said

Art Unit: 2179

tracks using said particular set of operations, wherein said particular set of operations comprise at least an effect (0070, 0071).

- As for claims 29-31: The method further comprising operating on said tracks using said particular set of operations, wherein said particular set of operations comprise at least a transition (0070, 0071).

- As for claims 32-34. The method further comprising operating on said tracks using said particular set of operations, wherein said particular set of operations comprise at least an effect and a transition (0070, 0071).

7. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pelley in view of Gagne.

- As for claim 38. Pelley is silent regarding a composite that is nested inside of another composite. However implementation of nested composite is disclosed by Gagne (figure 8). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine Gagne's teaching of nested composite to Pelley. Motivation of the combining is for providing nested editing operation.

Response to Arguments

8. Non-Statutory Double Patenting: The applicant request for the Double patenting rejection to be held in abeyance until the time of allowance is noted.

The 35 USC 101 rejection: As for claim 37-39: In response to the argument that data structure is statutory subject matter, a data structure per se is merely a collection of items not

Art Unit: 2179

tangibly embodied to have the capability of providing a tangible useful result, thus is non-statutory. The data structure as recited, is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable by a computer. It appears to be just a listing of information (“one or more portions associated with at least one track of a multimedia editing project..., one or more portions associated with a composite...”), i.e., a listing of non-functional descriptive material, thus is non-statutory. See Warmerdam, 33 F 3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held non-statutory).

In response to the argument that Pelley does not teach that the quantity of inputs and the quantity of outputs being scalable, Pelley discloses that the matrix switch being configured to route a scalable number of inputs to a scalable number of outputs (5:24 – 6:56. I.e., 53 inputs being scaled to 32 outputs and some of the outputs being redirected to input ports).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ba Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4138. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ba Huynh
Primary Examiner
AU 2179
5/24/07

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER